DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 757 CE 036 210

AUTHOR Stoddard, Susan; And Others
TITLE The Rehabilitation Executive's Evaluation System (TREES). Appendix A of: Vocational Rehabilitation Program Standards Evaluation System. Final Report. Volume II: Using the System: An Analytic Paradigm for Management.
INSTITUTION Berkeley Planning Associates, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY Rehabilitation Services Administration (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 11 Jun 82
CONTRACT HEW-105-76-4116; HEW-105-79-4000
NOTE 74p.; For related documents, see CE 036 208-212.
PUB TYPE Reports - General (140)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adults; Evaluation Methods; Guidelines; *Models; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; *Program Improvement; *Standards; *Vocational Rehabilitation
IDENTIFIERS *Rehabilitation Act 1973

ABSTRACT

The Program Standards Evaluation System was developed in response to evaluation requirements in the 1973 Rehabilitation Act. The system includes procedures for using standards data to monitor and evaluate vocational rehabilitation (VR) service outcomes and outputs as well as standards on key procedural issues. This report, which is Appendix A of the analytic paradigm for management use of the Program Standards Evaluation System, contains decision trees and displays for the data elements of the revised performance standards. The report is organized as follows: (1) decision trees are summarized in table format, indicating several possible explanatory scenarios for problematic performance on the data element; and (2) displays are keyed to each table, providing interpretation at various steps in the decision process and directing the analyst to the data elements. Most displays include a summary of the problem as defined by the relevant stage of investigation, including tests to use and norms for each data item. The tables, one for each element, show how the problem flagged by a particular element can be broken down into more specific subproblems by looking at other data items; table numbers correspond to the number of the data element in the standards system, and each table includes two or more possible scenarios that might explain problematic performance on the data element. Other displays show the logical steps summarized in the tables in more detail, introduce tests on other data elements, and compare the values of these elements with agency norms to analyze the display problem. In addition to the data-element-related tables, two special displays describe particular situations. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED230757

The Rehabilitation Executives's Evaluation System (TREES)

Appendix A of:
Vocational Rehabilitation Program Standards
Evaluation System Final Report: Volume II

Using the System:
An Analytic Paradigm for Management

June 11, 1982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. Stoddard
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Berkeley Planning Associates
3200 Adeline Street
Berkeley, California 94703
(415) 652-0999

CE036210

BPA project staff:

Contract HEW 105-79-4000

Susan Stoddard, Ph.D., Project Director
J. Mark Rogers, Deputy Project Director for Program Standards
Linda Toms Barker, Deputy Project Director for Project Standards
Richard Dodson, Ph.D., Project Co-Director, 1979-80

Staff: Sherry Almand, Joanne Bain, Linda Barrett, Dena Belzer, Eileen Bleeker, Frederick C. Collignon, Ph.D., Deborah Daro, Anne Gladman, Keith Gregory, Patricia Jenny, Fran Katsuranis, Ph.D., Shirley Langlois, Joe Mancini, Carol Meek, Judith L. Rill, Victor Russell and Caleb Whitaker

Contract HEW 105-76-4116

Frederick C. Collignon, Ph.D., Principal Investigator
Susan Shea, Project Director and Principal Investigator
Linda Barrett, Project Director

Staff: Gail Chiarrello, Beverly DeGraaf, Richard Dodson, Charles Froland, J. Mark Rogers, Gloria Root, Bruce Schmidt, Susan Stoddard, Chris Thompson, Deborah Wilkerson

Authors of this report:

Susan Stoddard, Ph.D., and J. Mark Rogers, with the assistance of Shirley Langlois and Patricia Jenny of BPA and Dr. Paul Mueller of the California Department of Rehabilitation.

This project has been funded at least in part with federal funds from the U.S. Department of Education under Contract Number HEW-105-79-4000. The program standards which were tested and refined in this contract were developed in a previous BPA contract, HEW-105-76-4116. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the U.S. Department of Education, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

THE REHABILITATION EXECUTIVE'S EVALUATION SYSTEM (TREES)

INTRODUCTION

This report contains decision trees and displays for the data elements of the revised performance standards. Decision trees are summarized in table format, indicating several possible explanatory scenarios for problematic performance on the data element. Each scenario is then traced through one, two, or three levels of further exploration to identify courses of corrective action for an agency to undertake in improving performance. Displays are keyed to each table; the displays provide interpretation at various steps in the decision process, and direct the analyst to the data elements, which should be used in juxtaposition to diagnose agency conditions. Most displays include a summary of the problem as defined by the relevant stage of investigation, include tests to use in exploring the problem, and allow for the entry of norms (performance levels) for each data item as well as the current agency measure. The displays typically either summarize the conclusions, or direct the analyst to other displays for further investigation.

The tables, one for each element, show how the problem flagged by a particular element can be broken down into more specific subproblems by looking at other data items (first-, second-, and sometimes third-level indicators). The table numbers correspond to the number of the data element in the standards system. Thus, Table 2ii refers to the second data element (ii) of Performance Standard 2. Each table includes two or more possible scenarios which might explain problematic performance on the data element. These "scenarios" can be followed from the left side of the table to the right. As we move from left to right, additional "indicators" are introduced, to further analyze the problem and identify program implications. Sometimes there are references (in boxes) to particular displays in this Appendix (e.g., "go to [1.1.7] ").

The displays show the logical steps summarized in the tables in more detail. The display numbering system has three numbers separated by periods (e.g., 4.2.1) and related to the standards, the data elements, and the logic sequence in the tables. The first number refers to the standard number; the second refers to the data element. The third number refers to the display's position in the table's logic system. An "0" indicates that the display relates to the overall problem flagged by the data element. The numbers 1, 2, . . . indicate the order that the secondary problems occur in the table. The numbering system is important, because the analyst may be referred to a particular display from a table or from another display.

The displays summarize the program problem indicated by the data element (primary problem) or by the data element in combination with other data (secondary problems). In most displays, tests on other data elements are introduced. The values of these elements are compared with agency norms or standards, to analyze the display problem. "Yes" or "no" responses to questions based on the comparisons of values to norms lead the analyst to more detailed interpretation of the agency problem, and to further tests or, with a statement like "go to Display 1.1.4," to the next displays in the analysis sequence. If the user is referred to further tests, the relevant values and norms are again defined in the display. If, instead, a "go to..." statement refers to a new display, the problem statement in the referenced display will be more detailed. The displays sometimes call for manager judgment, in addition to the kind of numerical comparison in the tests. The judgments are identified by Query.

In addition to the data-element-related tables and displays, there are two special displays. Display 10.1.0 includes a number of variables that might be used in an analysis of client data to explore a problem which cannot be pinpointed entirely through the logic system. This data can be used in bivariate or multivariate analysis of the program. Display 10.2.0, and the accompanying flow diagram, concerns agency time-in-status and case timeliness analysis. If case time in status or timeliness is indicated on the agency's performance problem, this display suggests an investigation approach.

The logical system presented here shows how the data items in the standards can be used to explore program relationships. Other data items could

be used like this as well, to build other logical "trees." As with any program analysis techniques, the exploratory method presented in the decision trees and displays should be used in combination with common sense about program operations. The data elements are intended to alert managers to deviation from rehabilitation goals.

State agency data should be used to analyze the frequency of the suggested scenarios and branches. Some of these may occur only rarely in a particular agency; others may account for most of the problems in performance. The most frequent branches should be further articulated and refined in the context of individual agency situations.

LIST OF TABLES AND DISPLAYS

SPECIFIC DATA ELEMENTS

Table 1(i): Standard One, Data Element One
Problem: # Clients per 100,000 State Population is Too Low

Display 1.1.0: Primary Problem: The number of units per 100,000 population is too low.

Display 1.1.1: Secondary Problem: The agency's # of clients per 100,000 state population is too low, and the current total caseload is too small.

Display 1.1.2: Secondary Problem: The agency's # of clients per 100,000 state population is too low; the current caseload is sufficient, but the agency is not bringing in enough new clients. Action is needed to increase acceptances.

Display 1.1.3: Secondary Problem: The agency's # of clients per 100,000 state population is too low; the agency served a sufficient number of clients but had too few closures relative to acceptances.

Display 1.1.4: Secondary Problem: The agency's # of clients per 100,000 state population is too low; the agency served a sufficient total caseload but there were too few closures and too few additional clients. Investigation and action is needed on both closure and acceptance rates.

Display 1.1.5: Secondary Problem: The agency's # of clients per 100,000 state population is too low. The total agency caseload is too small. Within the context of the current total caseload, client flow is acceptable. But, given the small size of the total caseload:

1. Take action to increase acceptance rate
2. Monitor closure rate.

Display 1.1.6: Secondary Problem: The agency's # of clients per 100,000 state population is too low. The total agency caseload is too small and closure rate is low. Speed closure rate in conjunction with efforts to increase acceptance.

Display 1.1.7: Secondary Problem: The agency's # of clients per 100,000 state population is too low. The total agency caseload is too low. Closure rate is adequate relative to total caseload but, relative to an already insufficient caseload, too new new clients are being admitted. Take action to increase acceptance.

Display 1.1.8: Secondary Problem: The agency's # of clients per 100,000 state population is too low. The total agency caseload is too small. The agency closure rate is too low and acceptance rate is low.

Table 1(ii): Standard One, Data Element Two
Problem: The Percentage of Caseload That is Severely Disabled is Too Low

Display 1.2.0: Primary Problem: The percentage of the caseload that is severely disabled is too low.

Display 1.2.1: Secondary Problem: The percentage of the caseload that is severel disabled is too low, but the number of SD clients meets agency standards and the rehabilitation rate of these clients is adequate.

Display 1.2.2: Secondary Problem: The percentage of the caseload that is severely disabled is too low, the number of SD clients meets agency standards, but their rehabilitation rate is too low.

Display 1.2.3: Secondary Problem: The percentage of the caseload that is severely disabled is too low, and the number of SD clients is too low; those clients do, however, have a success rate that is adequate.

Display 1.2.4: Secondary Problem: The percentage of the caseload that is severely disabled is too low and the number of SD clients is too low. The rehabilitation rate for SD clients is too low.

Table 2(i): Standard Two, Data Element One
Problem: Expenditures per Competitively Employed Rehabilitant Too High

Display 2.1.0: Primary Problem: Expenditures per competitively employed rehabilitant are too high.

Table 2(ii): Standard Two, Data Element One
Problem: Expenditures Per Rehabilitation Are Too High

Display 2.2.0: Primary Problem: Expenditures per rehabilitation are too high.

Display 2.2.1: Secondary Problem: Expenditures per rehabilitation are too high. Expenditures per closure and per case are acceptable.

Display 2.2.2: Secondary Problem: Expenditures per rehabilitation and per closure are too high. Expenditures per case are acceptable.

Display 2.2.3: Secondary Problem: Expenditures per rehabilitation and per case are too high. Expenditures per closure are acceptable.

Table 2(iii) and/or 2(iv): Standard Two, Data Elements Three and/or Four
Problem: The Ratio of Benefits to Costs (B/C) or the Net Benefit (B-C) or Both are Too Low

Display 2.3.0 and 2.4.0: Primary Problem: The ratio of benefits to costs or the net benefit, or both, are too low.

Table 3(i): Standard Three, Data Element One
Problem: Percentage of Rehabilitation is Too Low

Display 3.1.0: Primary Problem: Percentage of rehabilitations (% 26) is too low.

Display 3.1.1: Secondary Problem: Percentage of rehabilitations is too low, and so is the percentage of competitively closed 26s. However, the overall number of rehabilitations is at an acceptable level.

Display 3.1.2: Secondary Problem: The number and percentage of rehabilitations is too low, as is the percentage of rehabilitants closed competitively. This agency's overall rehabilitation rate is too low.

Display 3.1.3: Secondary Problem: The number and percentage of rehabilitations are both too low; however, the percentage of rehabilitants competitively employed is acceptable. Agency priority is on competitive employment and fewer clients are served.

Table 3(ii): Standard Three, Data Element Two
Problem: There is a Problem in the Annual Change in Rehabilitations

Display 3.2.0: Primary Problem: The annual change in rehabilitations is not adequate.

Table 4(i) and 5(ii): Standard Four, Data Element One and Standard Five, Data Element Two
Problem: % 26s Earning Weekly Minimum Wage is Too Low and/or % Competitively Employed 26s Earning Hourly Minimum Wage is Too Low

Display 4.1.0: Primary Problem: % 26s earning weekly minimum wage is too low.

Display 4.1.1: Secondary Problem: % 26s earning weekly minimum wage is too low, but both the % of competitively employed rehabilitants earning the minimum wage and the % of competitively employed rehabilitants are acceptable.

Display 4.1.2: Secondary Problem: % 26s earning weekly minimum wage is too low, as is the % competitively employed 26s with hourly earnings above the minimum wage. However, the % of rehabilitants competitively employed is acceptable.

Display 4.1.3: Secondary Problem: % 26s earning the weekly minimum wage is too low, but the % competitively employed 26s with hourly earnings above the minimum wage is acceptable. This agency generates too few C-E closures, thus reducing earnings for all 26s.

Display 4.1.4: Secondary Problem: % 26s earning weekly minimum wage is too low, the % of competitively employed rehabilitants with hourly earnings above minimum wage is too low, and the % of competitively employed 26s is too low for the agency.

Table 4(ii): Standard Four, Data Element Two
Problem: Average Earnings of Competitively Employed Rehabilitants Are Too Low When Compared to Average Earnings of Employees in State

Display 4.2.0: Primary Problem: Average earnings of competitively employed rehabilitants are too low when compared to average earnings of employees in state.

Display 4.2.1: Secondary Problem: The average earnings of competitively employed rehabilitants is too low when compared to average earnings of employees in the state. However, the relationship of median earnings for the two groups is acceptable.

Display 4.2.2: Secondary Problem: Both the average and median earnings of competitively employed rehabilitants are too low when compared to the average and median earnings, respectively, of employees in the state.

Table 5(i): Standard Five, Data Element One
Problem: Percentage of Competitively Employed Rehabilitants is Too Low

Display 5.1.0: Primary Problem: Percentage of competitively employed rehabilitants is too low.

Display 5.1.1: Secondary Problem: Percentage of competitively employed rehabilitants is too low. C-E goal/occupation correspondence ratio is too low and % N-C-E plans is too high.

Display 5.1.2: Secondary Problem: Percentage of competitively employed rehabilitants is too low. C-E goal/occupation correspondence is acceptable, but % N-C-E plans is too high.

Display 5.1.3: Secondary Problem: Percentage of competitively employed rehabilitants is too low but C-E goal/occupation correspondence and % N-C-E plans are acceptable.

Display 5.1.4: Secondary Problem: Percentage of competitively employed rehabilitants is too low. C-E goal/occupation correspondence is too low but % N-C-E plans is acceptable.

Table 6(i): Standard Six, Data Element One
Problem: Client Earning Gain is Insufficient

Display 6.1.0: Primary Problem: Client earning gain is insufficient.

Table 7(i): Standard Seven, Data Element One
Problem: There is a High Percentage of Clients Employed at Closure Who Have Not Retained Their Earnings at Follow-up

Display 7.1.0: Primary Problem: A high percentage of clients employed at closure have not retained their earnings at follow-up.

GENERAL CLIENT AND SERVICE ANALYSES

Display 10.1.0: Problem: Displays indicate need for analysis of agency client and service problems. Data files on variables such as the following should be used for statistical analysis of services.

ANALYSIS OF TIME-IN-STATUS PROBLEMS

Display 10.2.0: Select sample of active cases. Compare times in status with agency norms.

Table 1(i)

Standard One, Data Element One

Problem: # Clients Per 100,000 State Population is Too Low

Scenario	First Level Indicators		Second Level Indicators			Third Level Indicators
	# Served	Implications	# Closed / # Served	# Accepted / # Served	Implications	
1	Acceptable	The agency has a sufficient total caseload at present. Examine caseload data to determine longer run caseload picture.	Acceptable	Acceptable	No problems indicated	
			Acceptable	Too low	The agency is not bringing in enough clients. Take action to increase acceptances.	# applicants; 02 and 06 data Go to 1.1.2
			Too low	Acceptable	The agency served sufficient numbers of clients, but had too few closures. Take action to increase closure rate.	Go to 1.1.3
			Too low	Too low	The agency had a sufficient total caseload, but too few closures and too few additional clients. Investigation and action needed on both closure rate and acceptance rate.	Go to 1.1.4
2	Too low	The agency's total caseload is too small. Increase the rate for accepting new clients. Check caseload data.	Acceptable	Acceptable	Within the context of current total caseload size, client flow is acceptable. But, given the small size of the total caseload: (1) take action to increase acceptance rate, and (2) monitor future closure rate.	Go to 1.1.5
			Too low	Acceptable	The agency may already have problems processing and closing clients. Speed the rate of closures, in conjunction with efforts to improve acceptance.	Go to 1.1.6
			Acceptable	Too low	Relative to an already insufficient total caseload, too few clients are being admitted. Take action to increase acceptance.	Go to 1.1.7
			Too low	Too low	Increase number of acceptances and speed case flow.	Go to 1.1.8

A-11

DISPLAY 1.1.0

PRIMARY PROBLEM: THE NUMBER OF CLIENTS PER 100,000 POPULATION IS TOO LOW (REFER TO TABLE 1(i))

TEST: # CLIENTS SERVED (STATUSES 10-30) (FIRST LEVEL INDICATOR)

XXXXX (VALUE)

XXXXX (VALUE LAST YEAR)

XXXXX (PLANNED)

IS VALUE ACCEPTABLE? YES

NO

IF NO, GO TO DISPLAY 1.1.1

IF YES, THE AGENCY HAS A SUFFICIENT TOTAL CASELOAD AT PRESENT. EXAMINE CASELOAD DATA TO DETERMINE LONGER RUN CASELOAD PICTURE.

TEST: (SECOND LEVEL INDICATORS)

A. # CLOSED (28,30) / # SERVED (10-30)

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

ACCEPTABLE? YES

NO

B. # ACCEPTED (NEW 10s) / # SERVED (10-30)

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

ACCEPTABLE? YES

NO

IF YES TO A. AND B., NO PROBLEM IS INDICATED

IF YES TO A. AND NO TO B., GO TO DISPLAY 1.1.2

IF NO TO A. AND YES TO B., GO TO DISPLAY 1.1.3

IF NO TO BOTH A. AND B., GO TO DISPLAY 1.1.4

DISPLAY 1.1.1

SECONDARY PROBLEM: THE AGENCY'S # OF CLIENTS PER 100,000 STATE POPULATION IS TOO LOW, AND THE CURRENT TOTAL CASELOAD IS TOO SMALL.

TEST: (SECOND LEVEL INDICATORS)

A. $\frac{\text{\# CLOSED (28,30)}}{\text{\# SERVED (10-30)}}$

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

ACEPTABLE? YES

NO

B. $\frac{\text{\# ACCEPTED (NEW 10s)}}{\text{\# SERVED (10-30)}}$

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

ACCEPTABLE? YES

NO

IF YES TO A. AND B., GO TO DISPLAY 1.1.5

IF NO TO A. AND YES TO B., GO TO DISPLAY 1.1 6

IF YES TO A. AND NO TO B., GO TO DISPLAY 1.1.7

IF NO TO BOTH A. AND B., GO TO DISPLAY 1.1.8

DISPLAY 1.1.2

SECONDARY PROBLEM: THE AGENCY'S # OF CLIENTS PER 100,000 STATE POPULATION IS TOO LOW; THE CURRENT CASELOAD IS SUFFICIENT, BUT THE AGENCY IS NOT BRINGING IN ENOUGH NEW CLIENTS. ACTION IS NEEDED TO INCREASE ACCEPTANCES.

TEST: (THIRD LEVEL INDICATORS)

APPLICANTS (# OF ON-HAND AND NEW APPLICANTS)

(VALUE) XXXX ACCEPTABLE? YES

(NORM) XXXX NO

IF NO, IMPROVE OUTREACH.

IF YES, TEST FOR LENGTH OF APPLICATION PROCESS TO SEE IF IT IS TOO LONG.

AVERAGE MONTHS IN STATUS 02:

(VALUE) XX ACCEPTABLE? YES

(NORM) XX NO

IF NO, SPEED APPLICATION PROCESS.

IF YES, EXAMINE USE OF 06 (EXTENDED EVALUATION) STATUS TO DETERMINE IF IT IS BEING USED INAPPROPRIATELY.

A. $\frac{\text{\# 02 ENTERING 06}}{\text{\# 02}}$

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

ACCEPTABLE? YES

NO

B. AVERAGE MONTHS IN STATUS 06

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

ACCEPTABLE? YES

NO

IF YES TO A. OR B., ANALYZE CLIENTS IN 06. GO TO DISPLAY 10.1.0, CLIENT ANALYSIS, AND 10.2.0, TIMELINESS ANALYSIS, for 06.

IF NO TO A. AND B., CHECK ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATION POLICY TO DETERMINE IF IT IS APPROPRIATE.

DISPLAY 1.1.3

SECONDARY PROBLEM: THE AGENCY'S # OF CLIENTS PER 100,000 STATE POPULATION IS TOO LOW; THE AGENCY SERVED A SUFFICIENT NUMBER OF CLIENTS BUT HAD TOO FEW CLOSURES RELATIVE TO ACCEPTANCES

TEST: (THIRD-LEVEL INDICATORS)

CHECK IF PROBLEM IS EXPLAINED BY UNUSUAL INCREASE IN ACCEPTANCES

NEW STATUS 10s

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX (HISTORICAL DATA, LAST 3-YEAR AVERAGE)

UNUSUALLY HIGH? YES

NO

IF YES, THE LOW VALUE OF CLOSURES TO ACCEPTANCES MAY BE TEMPORARY. MONITOR THIS VALUE OVER THE NEXT QUARTERS.

IF NO, REVIEW CASES TO DETERMINE IF CLOSURES ARE IMMINENT:

$$\frac{\# 20 + \# 22}{10 \text{ to } 24}$$

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

HIGH % ABOUT TO BE CLOSED? YES

NO

IF YES, CLOSURE RATE SHOULD IMPROVE. MONITOR. IF NO IMPROVEMENT, GO TO DISPLAY 1.1.0.

IF NO, REVIEW SAMPLE OF CASES TO DETERMINE IF CURRENT CASES HAVE RELATIVELY LONG TIMES IN PROCESS. INSPECT CASES FOR: PLANNED DURATION OF SERVICE AND TYPES OF SERVICES PLANNED.

DISPLAY 1.1.4

SECONDARY PROBLEM: THE AGENCY'S # OF CLIENTS PER 100,000 STATE POPULATION IS TOO LOW; THE AGENCY SERVED A SUFFICIENT TOTAL CASELOAD BUT THERE WERE TOO FEW CLOSURES AND TOO FEW ADDITIONAL CLIENTS. INVESTIGATION AND ACTION IS NEEDED ON BOTH CLOSURE AND ACCEPTANCE RATES.

QUERY: WOULD ACCEPTANCE RATE BE IMPROVED BY CLOSING OUT MORE CLIENTS? (MANAGER JUDGMENT)

YES: GO TO DISPLAY 1.1.3

NO: GO TO DISPLAY 1.1.2

DISPLAY 1.1.5

SECONDARY PROBLEM: THE AGENCY'S # OF CLIENTS PER 100,000 STATE POPULATION IS TOO LOW. THE TOTAL AGENCY CASELOAD IS TOO SMALL. WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE CURRENT TOTAL CASELOAD, CLIENT FLOW IS ACCEPTABLE. BUT, GIVEN THE SMALL SIZE OF THE TOTAL CASELOAD:

1. TAKE ACTION TO INCREASE ACCEPTANCE RATE

2. MONITOR CLOSURE RATE

QUERY: WOULD ACCEPTANCE RATE BE IMPROVED BY CLOSING OUT MORE CLIENTS? (MANAGER JUDGMENT)

YES: GO TO DISPLAY 1.1.3

NO: GO TO DISPLAY 1.1.2

DISPLAY 1.1.6

SECONDARY PROBLEM: THE AGENCY'S # OF CLIENTS PER 100,000 STATE POPULATION IS TOO LOW. THE TOTAL AGENCY CASELOAD IS TOO SMALL AND CLOSURE RATE IS LOW. SPEED CLOSURE RATE IN CONJUNCTION WITH EFFORTS TO INCREASE ACCEPTANCE.

QUERY: WOULD ACCEPTANCE RATE BE IMPROVED BY CLOSING OUT MORE CLIENTS? (MANAGER JUDGMENT)

YES: GO TO DISPLAY 1.1.3

NO: GO TO DISPLAY 1.1.2

DISPLAY 1.1.7

SECONDARY PROBLEM: THE AGENCY'S # OF CLIENTS PER 100,000 STATE POPULATION IS TOO LOW. THE TOTAL AGENCY CASELOAD IS TOO LOW. CLOSURE RATE IS ADEQUATE RELATIVE TO TOTAL CASELOAD, BUT RELATIVE TO AN ALREADY INSUFFICIENT CASELOAD, TOO FEW NEW CLIENTS ARE BEING ADMITTED. TAKE ACTION TO INCREASE ACCEPTANCES.

GO TO TEST, DISPLAY 1.1.2

DISPLAY 1.1.8

SECONDARY PROBLEM: THE AGENCY'S # OF CLIENTS PER 100,000 STATE POPULATION IS TOO LOW. THE TOTAL AGENCY CASELOAD IS TOO SMALL. THE AGENCY CLOSURE RATE IS TOO LOW AND ACCEPTANCE RATE IS LOW.

QUERY: WOULD ACCEPTANCE RATE BE IMPROVED BY CLOSING OUT MORE CLIENTS? (MANAGER JUDGMENT)

YES: GO TO DISPLAY 1.1.3

NO: GO TO DISPLAY 1.1.2

Table 1(ii)

Standard One, Data Element Two

Problem: The Percentage of Caseload That Is Severely Disabled Is Too Low

Scenario	First Level Indicators			Second Level Indicator	
	# SDs in Caseload	Rehabilitation Rates for SDs adequate or too low compared to Agency Rehabilitation Rate?	Implications		Action
1	Adequate	Adequate	A small % of caseload is severely disabled but they are serviced enough and being successful; test for excessive service costs See 1.2.1	1a Expenditure/ Closure acceptable	No problem is indicated
				1b Expenditure/ Closure too high	Examine SD cases during case review to determine if too much is spent on the cases Go to 2.2.0
2	Adequate	Too low	Examine the rate and timeliness for SD clients	Are SD clients taking longer to serve so that their closures will be in future years?	If YES, forecast closure dates. Establish goal for closure rates based on this forecast. Monitor closure rates over time to test for long-run stability on this element
			See 1.2.2	When are SD clients not succeeding?	Examine patterns of non-success of SDs
3	Too low	Adequate	Either an outreach problem or an acceptance rate problem See 1.2.3	# 02s SD	If # 02s SD too low, review outreach procedures
				# closed 08 by reason of severity	If % 08 or # 08 by reason of severity screening may be too rigorous to meet agency goals. Do case reviews to determine feasibility of these cases
4	Too low	Too low	Same as 2 & 3 See 1.2.2 and 1.2.3 or see 1.2.4		

DISPLAY 1.2.0

PRIMARY PROBLEM: THE PERCENTAGE OF THE CASELOAD THAT IS SEVERELY DISABLED IS TOO LOW

(REFER TO TABLE 1(ii))

TEST: (FIRST LEVEL INDICATORS)

# SEVERELY DISABLED IN CASELOAD	REHABILITATION RATES FOR SDs COMPARABLE TO AGENCY REHABILITATION RATE?
	$\frac{\text{\# 26 SEVERELY DISABLED}}{\text{\# (26 + 28+ 30) SEVERELY DISABLED}}$
(NORM) XXXX	(NORM) XXXX
(VALUE) XXXX	(SD RATE) XXXX
A. TOO LOW?	B. TOO LOW COMPARED TO AGENCY RATE?
YES	YES
NO	NO

IF NO TO BOTH A. AND B., GO TO DISPLAY 1.2.1

IF NO TO A. AND YES TO B., GO TO DISPLAY 1.2.2

IF YES TO A. AND NO. TO B., GO TO DISPLAY 1.2.3

IF YES TO BOTH A. AND B., GO TO DISPLAYS 1.2.2 AND 1.2.3

DISPLAY 1.2.1

SECONDARY PROBLEM: THE PERCENTAGE OF THE CASELOAD THAT IS SEVERELY DISABLED IS TOO LOW, BUT THE NUMBER OF SD CLIENTS MEETS AGENCY STANDARDS AND THE REHABILITATION RATE OF THESE CLIENTS IS ADEQUATE.

TEST: (SECOND LEVEL INDICATORS)

CHECK IF THIS REPRESENTS EXCESSIVE COSTS

EXPENDITURE/CLOSURE TOO HIGH? YES

NO

IF YES:

A. EXAMINE SD CASES IN CASE REVIEW TO DETERMINE IF TOO MUCH IS SPENT ON THE CASES.

B. GO TO DISPLAY 2.2.0

IF NO, LOW PERFORMANCE ON THIS DATA ELEMENT DOES NOT INDICATE A PROBLEM.

DISPLAY 1.2.2

SECONDARY PROBLEM: THE PERCENTAGE OF THE CASELOAD THAT IS SEVERELY DISABLED IS TOO LOW, THE NUMBER OF SD CLIENTS MEETS AGENCY STANDARDS, BUT THEIR REHABILITATION RATE IS TOO LOW.

TEST: (SECOND LEVEL INDICATORS)

EXAMINE THE RATE AND TIMELINESS FOR SD CLIENTS

TIME IN PROCESS

(SDs) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

LONGER TIME FOR SERVICE? YES

NO

IF YES, FORECAST CLOSURE DATES AND ESTABLISH GOAL FOR CLOSURE RA[illegible] BASED ON THIS FORECAST. MONITOR CLOSURE RATES OVER TIME TO TEST FOR LONG-RUN STABILITY ON THIS ELEMENT.

ANALYZE NONSUCCESSFUL SDs TO DETERMINE REASONS FOR LOWER REHABILITATI[illegible] RATE.

DISPLAY 1.2.3

SECONDARY PROBLEM: THE PERCENTAGE OF THE CASELOAD THAT IS SEVERELY DISABLED IS TOO LOW, AND THE NUMBER OF SD CLIENTS IS TOO LOW; THOSE CLIENTS DO, HOWEVER, HAVE A SUCCESS RATE THAT IS ADEQUATE.

TEST: (SECOND LEVEL INDICATORS)

CHECK WHETHER THE PROBLEM IS EITHER IN LOW APPLICATION OF SDs OR IN THE ACCEPTANCE RATE, OR BOTH

$$\frac{\text{\# 02s SD}}{\text{\# 02s}}$$

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

TOO LOW? YES

NO

IF YES, REVIEW OUTREACH PROCEDURES TO INCREASE NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE SD APPLICANTS.

% CLOSED 08 BY REASON OF SEVERITY:

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

TOO HIGH? YES

NO

IF YES, DO CASE REVIEWS TO EXAMINE THE CASES CLOSED TOO SEVERE TO ASCERTAIN IF CRITERIA FOR ACCEPTANCE ARE TOO LIMITED.

DISPLAY 1.2.4

SECONDARY PROBLEM: THE PERCENTAGE OF THE CASELOAD THAT IS SEVERELY DISABLED IS TOO LOW AND THE NUMBER OF SD CLIENTS IS TOO LOW. THE REHABILITATION RATE FOR SD CLIENTS IS TOO LC

GO TO TESTS ON DISPLAYS 1.2.2 AND 1.2.3

Table 2(i)

Standard Two, Data Element One

Problem: Expenditures Per Competitively Employed Rehabilitant Too High

Scenario	First Level Indicators		
	Expenditures Per 26 (2ii)	Percent 26 Closures Competitively Employed (5i)	Implications
1	Acceptable	Acceptable	May not be an expenditure problem. Recheck method for setting performance levels for competitive 26 (too high?) or all 26s (too low?)
2	Acceptable	Too low	Before your expenditures per competitively employed 26s can be at an acceptable level, you must increase the percent of your 26 closures who are competitively employed Go to 5.1.0
3	Too high	Acceptable	Since your percent of 26 closures who are competitively employed is acceptable, the problems you face with your expenditures per 26 are the same as the problems you face with this data element Go to 2.2.0
4	Too high	Too low	You have both a problem in your percent 26 closures who are competitively employed and in your expenditures per 26 Go to 2.2.0 and 5.1.0

DISPLAY 2.1.0

PRIMARY PROBLEM: EXPENDITURES PER COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED REHABILITANT ARE TOO HIGH

(REFER TO TABLE 2(i))

TEST: (FIRST LEVEL INDICATORS)

A. TOTAL EXPENDITURES/# 26		B. # 26 COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED/# 26	
(VALUE)	XXXX	(VALUE)	XXXX
(NORM)	XXXX	(NORM)	XXXX
TOO HIGH?	YES	TOO LOW?	YES
	NO		NO

IF NO TO A. AND B., NO PROBLEM IS INDICATED. RECHECK THE AGENCY METHOD FOR SETTING PERFORMANCE LEVELS FOR COMPETITIVE REHABILITATIONS (TOO HIGH?) OR FOR ALL REHABILITATIONS (TOO LOW?).

IF NO TO A. AND YES TO B., GO TO DISPLAY 5.1.0.

IF YES TO A. AND NO TO B., GO TO DISPLAY 2.2.0.

IF YES TO A. AND B., GO TO DISPLAYS 2.2.0 and 5.1.0.

Table 2(ii)

Standard Two, Data Element Two

Problem: Expenditures Per Rehabilitation Are Too High

Scenario	First Level Indicators: Expenditure/ Closure	First Level Indicators: Expenditure/Case	First Level Indicators: Implication	Second Level Indicators	Second Level Indicators: "Leading Questions"	Third Level Indicators (if applicable)	Third Level Indicators: Evaluation Questions
1	Acceptable	Acceptable	Agency is achieving too low a proportion of 26 closures	Standards Data Element 3(i) $\left(\frac{\#26}{\#26+\#28+\#30}\right)$ See 2.2.1	Is the % too low? If yes, why?		Analysis of successful closures Go to 3.1.0
					If no, which clients or components cost too much?	Service costs to: -- 26s -- 28s and 30s -- 08s	What is the average life-of-case cost for each closure group? What proportion of total life-of-case costs are spent on each closure group?
						Service costs by service type See 10.1.0	What proportion of current service costs went to each service type? What is the average cost of each service type, for clients receiving that service?
2	Too High	Acceptable	Agency is serving clients too slowly: achieving too few closures	Post-Acceptance Closure Rate $\left(\frac{\#26+\#28+\#30}{\#\text{ open cases}}\right)$ See 2.2.2	Is the service process too slow?	Timeliness: Statuses 10-12/12-24 Average time from acceptance to closure (10-24)	Which aspect of services for accepted clients takes relatively too long?
					Have we had a recent influx of acceptances?	Rate of acceptance	None (end of investigation)
3	Acceptable	Too High	Agency has recently developed a bottleneck in intake process: too few clients being accepted into the system	Standards Data Element 1(ii) $\left(\frac{\#\text{ served (10-30)}}{100{,}000\text{ population}}\right)$ Rate of acceptance $\left(\frac{\#\text{ of new status 10s}}{\#\text{ new applicants} + \#\text{ on-hand applicants} + \#\text{ on-hand 06s}}\right)$ See 2.2.3	Do we have too few applicants?	# of applicants (From RSA-101)	Could outreach be made more effective? Go to 1.1.0
					Does use of Extended Evaluation account for the low acceptance rate?	R-300 item (06 takes too long) % 02 => 06 (too many enter 06)	What kinds of clients are going into 06? What kinds of services are provided during 06?
					Do we have too many ineligible applicants?	02 => 08 and 06 => 08	What reasons are given for closing clients ineligible? From where are these clients being referred?
4	Too High	Too High	Agency has both an intake and a timeliness problem	Same as 2 and 3 See 2.2.2 and 2.2.3		Same as 2 and 3	

A-29

DISPLAY 2.2.0

PRIMARY PROBLEM: EXPENDITURES PER REHABILITATION ARE TOO HIGH
(REFER TO TABLE 2(ii))

TEST: (FIRST LEVEL INDICATORS)

A. $\frac{\text{TOTAL EXPENDITURES}}{\text{\# CLOSURES (26-30)}}$

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

TOO HIGH? YES

NO

B. $\frac{\text{TOTAL EXPENDITURES}}{\text{\# CASES (10-30)}}$

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

TOO HIGH? YES

NO

IF NO TO BOTH A. AND B., GO TO DISPLAY 2.2.1

IF YES TO A. AND NO TO B., GO TO DISPLAY 2.2.2

IF NO TO A. AND YES TO B., GO TO DISPLAY 2.2.3

IF YES TO BOTH A. AND B., GO TO DISPLAY 2.2.2 AND 2.2.3

DISPLAY 2.2.1

SECONDARY PROBLEM: EXPENDITURES PER REHABILITATION ARE TOO HIGH. EXPENDITURES PER CLOSURE AND PER CASE ARE ACCEPTABLE.

TEST: (SECOND LEVEL INDICATORS)

CHECK IF AGENCY IS ACHIEVING A PROPORTION OF 26 CLOSURES THAT IS TOO LOW

$$\frac{\#\ 26}{26+28+30}$$

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

TOO LOW? YES

NO

IF YES, GO TO DISPLAY 3.1.0

IF NO, CONDUCT EVALUATION TO ANALYZE WHICH CLIENTS OR SERVICE COMPONENTS ACCOUNT FOR THE HIGH COST (SEE DISPLAY 10.1.0).

DISPLAY 2.2.2

SECONDARY PROBLEM: EXPENDITURES PER REHABILITATION AND PER CLOSURE ARE TOO HIGH. EXPENDITURES PER CASE ARE ACCEPTABLE.

TEST: (SECOND LEVEL INDICATORS)

CHECK IF THE AGENCY IS ACHIEVING TOO FEW CLOSURES, OR IF THERE WAS A LARGE NUMBER OF NEW CLIENTS LAST YEAR

POST-CLOSURE ACCEPTANCE RATE:

$$\frac{\#\ 26+28+30}{\#\ \text{OPEN CASES}}$$

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

TOO LOW? YES

NO

IF YES, SERVICE PROCESS IS TOO SLOW; GO TO 10.2.0.

IF NO, TEST FOR # OPEN CASES

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

TOO HIGH? YES

NO

IF YES, THE RECENT CLIENT INFLUX EXPLAINS LOW RATES VALUE.

DISPLAY 2.2.3

SECONDARY PROBLEM: EXPENDITURES PER REHABILITATION AND PER CASE ARE TOO HIGH. EXPENDITURES PER CLOSURE ARE ACCEPTABLE.

TEST: (SECOND LEVEL INDICATORS)

CHECK IF THE AGENCY HAS RECENTLY DEVELOPED A BOTTLENECK AT INTAKE, SO THAT TOO FEW CLIENTS ARE BEING ACCEPTED.

TEST: APPLICATION RATE

$$\frac{\text{\# SERVED}}{\text{100,000 POPULATION}}$$

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

TOO LOW? YES

NO

IF YES, GO TO DISPLAY 1.1.0. CHECK IF OUTREACH MEASURES COULD BE MADE MORE EFFECTIVE.

CHECK RATE OF ACCEPTANCE

$$\frac{\text{\# NEW STATUS 10s}}{\text{CASELOAD}}$$

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

TOO LOW? YES

NO

IF YES, ANALYZE: # APPLICANTS: TOO FEW?

02s X 06s: TOO MANY IN EXTENDED EVALUATION?

02s X 08s: TOO MANY INELIGIBLE APPLICANTS?

06s X 08s: TOO MANY INELIGIBLE APPLICANTS?

(SEE DISPLAY 10.1.0)

Table 2(iii) and/or 2(iv)

Standard Two, Data Elements Three and/or Four

Problem: The Ratio of Benefits to Costs (B/C) or the Net Benefit (B-C) or Both Are Too Low

Scenario	First Level Indicators		Second Level Indicators		
	Expenditures/ Rehabilitation	Implication			
1	Acceptable	The costs do not appear out of line. The type of rehabilitation the agency is producing is not producing high-payoff return to society.	Is % rehabilitations closed competitively too low?	Yes	Go to 5.1.0
				No	Are salaries too low? Go to 4.1.0
2	Too high	Go to 2.2.0			

DISPLAY 2.3.0 AND 2.4.0

PRIMARY PROBLEM: THE RATIO OF BENEFITS TO COSTS OR THE NET BENEFIT, OR BOTH, ARE TOO LOW.

(REFER TO TABLE 2(iii) AND/OR 2(iv))

TEST: (FIRST LEVEL INDICATOR)

TOTAL EXPENDITURES/# 26

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

ACCEPTABLE? YES

NO

IF YES, THE COSTS ARE NOT OUT OF LINE. THE TYPE OF REHABILITATION IS NOT PRODUCING A HIGH PAYOFF RETURN TO SOCIETY.

IF NO, GO TO DISPLAY 2.2.0.

TEST: (SECOND LEVEL INDICATOR)

26 COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED/# 26

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXX

TOO LOW? YES

NO

IF YES, GO TO DISPLAY 5.1.0.

IF NO, GO TO DISPLAY 4.1.0.

Table 3(i)

Standard Three, Data Element One

Problem: Percentage of Rehabilitations Is Too Low

Scenario	First Level Indicators			Second Level Indicators	
	# 26s	% in Competitive Employment	Implications		Implications
1	Acceptable	Acceptable	Low % rehabilitants does not mean there is a problem. The acceptable levels of rehabilitation and % competitively employed suggest that possibly the performance level for this element is set too high.		
2	Acceptable	Too low	Agency has a high percentage of noncompetitive placements Go to 5.1.0 for actions to increase number and % of competitive placements. See 5.1.1		
3	Too low	Too low	Overall rehabilitation level is too low.	Is expenditure/rehabilitation too high? See 3.1.2	Yes: Investigate ways to increase service efficiency. Go to 2.2.0 No: Analyze non-successful clients in terms of client characteristics, services received, etc. Go to 10.1.0
4	Too low	Acceptable	Agency priority is on competitive employment, and fewer clients are served.	Is expenditure/competitive 26 too high? See 3.1.3	Yes: Investigate ways to increase service efficiency. Go to 2.2.0 No: Analyze non-successfuls in terms of client characteristics and services received. Go to 10.1.0

DISPLAY 3.1.0

PRIMARY PROBLEM: PERCENTAGE OF REHABILITATIONS (% 26) IS TOO LOW.
(REFER TO TABLE 3(i))

TEST: (FIRST LEVEL INDICATORS)

EXAMINE THE TOTAL NUMBER OF REHABILITATIONS (#26) AND, OF THOSE, THE PERCENTAGE PLACED IN COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT (% C-E)

# 26s		# 26 COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED/# 26	
(VALUE)	XXXX	(VALUE)	XXXX
(NORM)	XXXX	(NORM)	XXXX

A. ACCEPTABLE LEVEL? YES NO

B. ACCEPTABLE LEVEL? YES NO

IF YES TO A. AND B., NO PROBLEM IS INDICATED, SINCE % COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED IS A MORE POWERFUL MEASURE.

IF YES TO A. AND NO TO B., GO TO DISPLAY 3.1.1.

IF NO TO A. AND B., GO TO DISPLAY 3.1.2.

IF NO TO A. AND YES TO B., GO TO DISPLAY 3.1.3.

DISPLAY 3.1.1

SECONDARY PROBLEM: PERCENTAGE OF REHABILITATIONS IS TOO LOW, AND SO IS THE PERCENTAGE OF COMPETITIVELY CLOSED 26s. HOWEVER, THE OVERALL NUMBER OF REHABILITATIONS IS AT AN ACCEPTABLE LEVEL.

THIS CONDITION IMPLIES THAT THE AGENCY HAS A HIGH PERCENTAGE OF NON-COMPETITIVE PLACEMENTS.

INCREASE NUMBER AND % OF COMPETITIVE PLACEMENTS. GO TO DISPLAY 5.1.0.

DISPLAY 3.1.2

SECONDARY PROBLEM: THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF REHABILITATIONS IS TOO LOW, AS IS THE PERCENTAGE OF REHABILITANTS CLOSED COMPETITIVELY. THIS AGENCY'S OVERALL REHABILITATION RATE IS TOO LOW

TEST: (SECOND LEVEL INDICATORS)

CHECK IF COST/REHABILITATION IS TOO HIGH

TOTAL EXPENDITURES/# 26

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

TOO HIGH? YES

NO

IF YES, INVESTIGATE WAYS TO INCREASE SERVICE EFFICIENCY. GO TO DISPLAY 2.2.0.

IF NO, ANALYZE NONSUCCESSFUL CLIENTS IN TERMS OF CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS, SERVICES RECEIVED, ETC. GO TO DISPLAY 10.1.0.

DISPLAY 3.1.3

SECONDARY PROBLEM: THE NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF REHABILITATIONS ARE BOTH TOO LOW; HOWEVER, THE PERCENTAGE OF REHABILITANTS COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED IS ACCEPTABLE. AGENCY PRIORITY IS ON COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT AND FEWER CLIENTS ARE SERVED.

TEST: (SECOND LEVEL INDICATORS)

CHECK IF COST/COMPETITIVE 26 IS TOO HIGH.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES/# 26 COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

TOO HIGH? YES

NO

IF YES, INVESTIGATE WAYS TO INCREASE SERVICE EFFICIENCY. GO TO DISPLAY 2.2.0.

IF NO, ANALYZE NONSUCCESSFUL CLIENTS IN TERMS OF CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS, SERVICES RECEIVED, ETC. GO TO DISPLAY 10.1.0.

Table 3(ii)

Standard Three, Data Element Two

Problem: There is a Problem in the Annual Change in Rehabilitations

Scenario	First Level Indicators	
	Number of 26 Closures in Current Year	Implications
1	Too low	Agency closure problem is confirmed by this data element. Go to 3.1.0
2	Adequate	Agency production, while still adequate, shows decline. Examine current caseload size to determine if decline is temporary. If not, increase acceptances. Go to 1.1.2

DISPLAY 3.2.0

PRIMARY PROBLEM: THE ANNUAL CHANGE IN REHABILITATIONS IS NOT ADEQUATE.
(REFER TO TABLE 3(ii))

TEST: (FIRST LEVEL INDICATOR)

NUMBER OF 26 CLOSURES

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

ACCEPTABLE? YES

NO

IF NO, GO TO DISPLAY 3.1.0.

IF YES, GO TO DISPLAY 1.1.2.

Table 4(i) and 5(ii)

Standard Four, Data Element One and Standard Five, Data Element Two

Problem: % 26s Earning Weekly Minimum Wage is Too Low and/or

% Competitively Employed 26s Earning Hourly Minimum Wage is Too Low

	First Level Indicators			Second Level Indicators	
Scenario	% C-E* 26s with hourly earnings above minimum wage (5ii)	# C-E* 26s / # 26s	Implications	Leading Questions	Actions
1	Acceptable	Acceptable See 4.1.1	The agency generates enough c-e closures, and those closures earn adequate hourly wages. Low weekly wages may result from too many part-time (PT) closure occupations. Check on hours worked by rehabilitants.	Do PT workers desire PT work? (case review)	If not, review placement policy; consider possibility of encouraging clients to go for full-time employment
				Do placement strategies reflect the client's employment goals?	Go to 5.1.1 Replace "C-E/N-C-E" with "FT/PT" Determine if your lack of FT closures is due to: inadequate placement, inadequate and/or inappropriate services, or client difficulty
2	Acceptable	Too low See 4.1.2	The agency generates enough c-e closures, but their hourly earnings are low. Regardless of # of hours worked, agency needs to improve hourly earnings.	Do the job goals for c-e closures aim for sufficient earnings?	Go to 4.2.2 Include analysis of job market vis-a-vis earnings levels
				Are the job goals feasible?	Go to 5.1.1 Replace "C-E/N-C-E" with "earns weekly minimum wage/doesn't earn weekly minimum wage"
			Agency may also have too many PT closures	To scenario 1 above	Go to 4.1.1
3	Too low	Acceptable See 4.1.3	The agency generates too few c-e closures, thus reducing earnings for all 26's	Does the agency generate enough competitive employment plans?	Go to 5.1.0
4	Too low	Too low See 4.1.4	The agency has two problems: It generates an insufficient # of c-e closures	Go to scenario 3, above, 4.1.3	
			AND	AND	
			Its c-e closures earn insufficient hourly wages	Go to scenario 2, above, 4.1.2	

* C-E = competitive employment
N-C-E = non-competitive employment

DISPLAY 4.1.0

PRIMARY PROBLEM: % 26s EARNING WEEKLY MINIMUM WAGE IS TOO LOW.
(REFER TO TABLE 4(i)/5(ii))

TEST: (FIRST LEVEL INDICATORS)

A. % COMPETITIVE 26s WITH HOURLY EARNINGS ABOVE MINIMUM WAGE

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

TOO LOW? YES

NO

B. $\frac{\text{\% 26s COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED}}{\text{\# 26}}$

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

TOO LOW? YES

NO

IF NO TO A. AND B., GO TO DISPLAY 4.1.1.

IF YES TO A. AND NO TO B., GO TO DISPLAY 4.1.2.

IF NO TO A. AND YES TO B., GO TO DISPLAY 4.1.3.

IF YES TO A. AND B., GO TO DISPLAY 4.1.2 and 4.1.3. THIS AGENCY HAS TWO PROBLEMS: IT GENERATES AN INSUFFICIENT NUMBER OF C-E CLOSURES AND ITS C-E CLOSURES EARN INSUFFICIENT HOURLY WAGES.

$$\frac{\text{\# 26 C-E* EARNING AT LEAST THE HOURLY MINIMUM WAGE}}{\text{\# 26 COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED}}$$

*C-E = COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED

DISPLAY 4.1.1

SECONDARY PROBLEM: % 26s EARNING WEEKLY MINIMUM WAGE IS TOO LOW, BUT BOTH THE % OF COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED REHABILITANTS EARNING THE MINIMUM WAGE AND THE % OF COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED REHABILITANTS ARE ACCEPTABLE.

TEST: (SECOND LEVEL INDICATORS)

CHECK IF THE LOW WEEKLY WAGES ARE EXPLAINED BY TOO MANY PART-TIME CLOSURE OCCUPATIONS

AVERAGE HOURS WORKED/WEEK: XX

FULL-TIME HOURS/WEEK: 40

IF AVERAGE IS LOW, DO CASE REVIEW TO DETERMINE IF FULL-TIME WORK WAS CLIENT'S GOAL. DO PLACEMENT STRATEGIES REFLECT THE CLIENT'S EMPLOYMENT GOALS?

YES

NO

IF NO, REVIEW PLACEMENT POLICY -- CONSIDER POSSIBILITY OF ENCOURAGING CLIENTS TO GO FOR FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT. GO TO DISPLAY 5.1.1 AND REPLACE "C-E/N-C-E"* WITH FT/PT**.

*C-E = COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT

N-C-E = NONCOMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT

**FT = FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT

PT = PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT

DISPLAY 4.1.2

SECONDARY PROBLEM: % 26s EARNING WEEKLY MINIMUM WAGE IS TOO LOW, AS IS THE % COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED 26s WITH HOURLY EARNINGS ABOVE THE MINIMUM WAGE. HOWEVER, THE % OF REHABILITANTS COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED IS ACCEPTABLE.

TEST: (SECOND LEVEL INDICATORS)

CHECK IF HOURLY EARNINGS ARE TOO LOW

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

TOO LOW? YES

NO

IF YES, AND IF CASE REVIEW INDICATES THAT THE JOB GOALS FOR COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED CLOSURES AIM FOR SUFFICIENT WAGES, GO TO DISPLAY 4.2.2 AND INCLUDE ANALYSIS OF THE JOB MARKET VIS-A-VIS EARNINGS LEVELS.

CHECK IF CLIENT JOB GOALS ARE IN DEMAND. (JOB MARKET REVIEW)

GO TO DISPLAY 5.1.1 BUT REPLACE "C-E/N-C-E"* WITH "EARNS WEEKLY MINIMUM WAGE/ DOESN'T EARN WEEKLY MINIMUM WAGE."

CHECK IF THERE ARE TOO MANY PART-TIME CLOSURES.

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

TOO MANY? YES

NO

IF YES, GO TO DISPLAY 4.1.1.

*C-E = COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED
N-C-E = NON-COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED

DISPLAY 4.1.3

SECONDARY PROBLEM: % 26s EARNING THE WEEKLY MINIMUM WAGE IS TOO LOW. THE % 26s COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED IS TOO LOW, BUT THE % COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED 26s WITH HOURLY EARNINGS ABOVE THE MINIMUM WAGE IS ACCEPTABLE. THIS AGENCY GENERATES TOO FEW C-E*CLOSURES, THUS REDUCING EARNINGS FOR ALL 26s.

TEST: (SECOND LEVEL INDICATORS)

CHECK IF THE AGENCY GENERATES ENOUGH COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT PLANS.

$$\frac{\text{\# C-E* PLANS IN YEAR}}{\text{TOTAL PLANS IN YEAR}}$$

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

ADEQUATE? YES

NO

IF NO, GO TO DISPLAY 5.1.0.

*C-E = COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED

DISPLAY 4.1.4

SECONDARY PROBLEM: % 26s EARNING WEEKLY MINIMUM WAGE IS TOO LOW, THE % OF COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED REHABILITANTS WITH HOURLY EARNINGS ABOVE MINIMUM WAGE IS TOO LOW, AND THE % OF COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED 26s IS TOO LOW FOR THE AGENCY.

GO TO DISPLAYS 4.1.2 and 4.1.3.

Table 4(ii)

Standard Four, Data Element Two

Problem: Average Earnings of Competitively Employed Rehabilitants Are Too Low When Compared to Average Earnings of Employees in State

Scenario	First Level Indicators	Second Level Indicators			Third Level Indicators		
	Compare Median Income of Competitively Employed 26s to the Median Income of Employees in the State		Leading Questions	Implications		Leading Questions	Implications
1	Acceptable	Comparison of the median income to the mean income of competitively employed 26 closures	Median income is less than mean income	Although the medians compare well, it is because there are many closures in low paying jobs. Go to 4.2.2			
			Median income is greater than or equal to mean	The problem does appear to be be artificially caused by the method of measurement. See 4.2.1			
2	Too low	DOT codes of the job goals of competitively employed 26 closures	Were clients' job goals in sufficiently high paying occupations? Yes	Although job goals are in fields that pay well in comparison to employees in the state, closures are not realizing these earnings. See 4.2.2	DOT codes of job goals and DOT codes of jobs obtained at closure	Is the closure DOT code greater than or equal to the DOT code of the job goal? Yes	You are providing services for and are making placements in acceptable pay job categories. But your closures are earning less than their counterparts in the state. Is there something about your service program that could be improved to better prepare clients and increase their earning potential?
						No	Clients are getting lower paying jobs than what they originally aspired to. • Examine your placement effort. With additional placement assistance, could your clients obtain better paying jobs? • Do the job goals of clients exist in your state? If they don't -- clients should have goals that are also in sufficiently high paying jobs.
			No	Clients are not being prepared for jobs that pay well in comparison to other employees in the state. Examine the types of services you provide. You should be providing services that will result in higher paying jobs at closure.	None	None	None

DISPLAY 4.2.0

PRIMARY PROBLEM: AVERAGE EARNINGS OF COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED REHABILITANTS ARE TOO LOW WHEN COMPARED TO AVERAGE EARNINGS OF EMPLOYEES IN STATE (REFER TO TABLE 4(ii))

TEST: (SECOND-LEVEL INDICATORS)

$$\frac{\text{MEDIAN INCOME OF COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED 26s}}{\text{MEDIAN INCOME OF EMPLOYEES IN THE STATE}}$$

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

ACCEPTABLE RATIO? YES

NO

IF YES: GO TO DISPLAY 4.2.1

IF NO: GO TO DISPLAY 4.2.2

DISPLAY 4.2.1

SECONDARY PROBLEM: THE AVERAGE EARNINGS OF COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED REHABILITANTS IS TOO LOW WHEN COMPARED TO AVERAGE EARNINGS OF EMPLOYEES IN THE STATE. HOWEVER, THE RELATIONSHIP OF MEDIAN EARNINGS FOR THE TWO GROUPS IS ACCEPTABLE.

TEST: (SECOND-LEVEL INDICATORS)

IDENTIFY THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE MEDIAN AND MEAN INCOME VALUES FOR COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED 26s

(MEDIAN) XXXX

(MEAN) XXXX

IF THE MEAN IS GREATER, GO TO DISPLAY 4.2.2

IF THE MEDIAN IS GREATER, THE PROBLEM FLAGGED BY THE DATA ELEMENTS APPEARS TO BE ARTIFICIALLY CAUSED BY THE SELECTION OF THE MEAN AS THE MEASURE OF CENTRAL TENDENCY.

DISPLAY 4.2.2

SECONDARY PROBLEM: BOTH THE AVERAGE AND MEDIAN EARNINGS OF COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED REHABILITANTS ARE TOO LOW WHEN COMPARED TO THE AVERAGE AND MEDIAN EARNINGS, RESPECTIVELY, OF EMPLOYEES IN THE STATE

TEST: (SECOND-LEVEL INDICATORS)

USE D.O.T. CODES OF THE JOB GOALS OF COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED 26s TO EXAMINE IF CLIENT JOB GOALS ARE IN SUFFICIENTLY HIGH-PAYING OCCUPATIONS

YES

NO

IF YES, CLIENTS ARE NOT ACHIEVING THE LEVEL OF CLOSURE PLANNED AS A GOAL. COMPARE D.O.T. CODES OF GOALS TO PLAN TO DETERMINE WHETHER:

A. PLACEMENT FITS GOAL, BUT CLIENT'S SALARY IS LOWER THAN PLACEMENT WOULD SUGGEST

B. PLACEMENTS ARE IN LOWER PAYING JOBS THAN PLANNED

IF NO, EXAMINE YOUR GOAL-PLANNING PROCESSES. ATTEMPT TO DETERMINE THE REASONS WHY COUNSELORS PLAN FOR LOW-PAYING JOBS. POSSIBLE REASONS INCLUDE:

- THE SERVICES NEEDED TO GET CLIENTS INTO HIGHER-PAYING JOBS ARE LACKING;
- COUNSELORS ARE UNAWARE OF AVAILABLE HIGHER-PAYING JOBS;
- COUNSELORS ARE UNAWARE OF THE AGENCY'S GOALS FOR CLOSURE WAGES.

Table 5(i)

Standard Five, Data Element One

Problem: Percentage of Competitively Employed Rehabilitants Is Too Low

Scenario	First Level Indicators			Second Level Indicators			Third Level Indicators		
	C-E* Goal/ Occupation Correspondence	% N-C-E** Plans	Implications			Implications			Implications
1	Low	High	Staff planned for but failed to achieve sufficient C-E closures. Current planning is for too few C-E plans.	Investigate reasons for emphasis on N-C-E plans. May wish to intervene with current caseload, or use results of investigation to change future field practices.		See 5.1.1			
2	Acceptable	High	Plans for too many N-C-E closures both in the past and currently.	Check rehabilitation rate for agency: # 26 / All cases Too low?	Yes	Go to 3.1.0			
					No	Check appropriateness of N-C-E plans and closures for closure group.			
						See 5.1.2			
3	Acceptable	Acceptable	There were plans for too many N-C-E closures for this year's rehabilitants, but this year's planning seems to have corrected this.	Monitor current caseload. Are there sufficient C-E clients for the current period?	Yes	No current problem			
					No	Check appropriateness of current N-C-E plans.			
						See 5.1.3			
4	Low	Acceptable	Staff planned for but failed to achieve sufficient C-E closures. Current planning is for sufficient C-E.	Does goal planning realistically reflect labor market?	Yes		Are placement efforts adequate?	Yes	Perform comparison analysis on C-E and N-C-E clients to identify patterns in clients or services.
								No	Improve placement effort
					No	Disseminate information to the field on labor market demand. Monitor ongoing goal setting, and direct counselors to set goals reflective of that demand.			
				See 5.1.4					

*C-E = Competitive Employment
**N-C-E = Noncompetitive Employment

DISPLAY 5.1.0

PRIMARY PROBLEM: PERCENTAGE OF COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED REHABILITANTS IS TOO LOW.

(REFER TO TABLE 5(i))

TEST: (FIRST LEVEL INDICATORS)

A. C-E* GOAL-OCCUPATION CORRESPONDENCE

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

ACCEPTABLE? YES

NO

B. $\frac{\text{\% N-C-E* PLANS IN YEAR}}{\text{TOTAL PLANS IN YEAR}}$

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

ACCEPTABLE? YES

NO

IF NO TO A. AND B., GO TO DISPLAY 5.1.1.

IF YES TO A. AND NO TO B., GO TO DISPLAY 5.1.2.

IF YES TO A. AND B., GO TO DISPLAY 5.1.3.

IF NO TO A. AND YES TO B., GO TO DISPLAY 5.1.4.

61

*C-E = COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT
N-C-E = NON-COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT

DISPLAY 5.1.1

SECONDARY PROBLEM: PERCENTAGE OF COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED REHABILITANTS IS TOO LOW. C-E* GOAL/OCCUPATION CORRESPONDENCE RATIO IS TOO LOW AND % N-C-E* PLANS IS TOO HIGH.

CURRENT PLANNING IS FOR TOO FEW C-E PLANS. INVESTIGATE REASONS FOR EMPHASIS ON N-C-E PLANS.

CHECK APPROPRIATENESS OF N-C-E PLANS AND CLOSURES.

*C-E = COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT
N-C-E = NON-COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT

DISPLAY 5.1.2

SECONDARY PROBLEM: PERCENTAGE OF COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED REHABILITANTS IS TOO LOW. C-E* GOAL/OCCUPATION CORRESPONDENCE IS ACCEPTABLE BUT % N-C-E* PLANS IS TOO HIGH.

TEST: (SECOND LEVEL INDICATORS)

REHABILITATION RATE

$$\frac{\#\ 26s}{\text{ALL CASES}}$$

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

TOO LOW? YES

NO

IF YES, GO TO DISPLAY 3.1.0.

IF NO, CHECK APPROPRIATENESS OF N-C-E PLANS.

*C-E = COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT
N-C-E = NON-COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT

DISPLAY 5.1.3

SECONDARY PROBLEM: PERCENTAGE OF COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED REHABILITANTS IS TOO LOW BUT C-E* GOAL/OCCUPATION CORRESPONDENCE AND % N-C-E* PLANS ARE ACCEPTABLE.

MONITOR CURRENT CASELOAD TO TEST IF THERE ARE SUFFICIENT C-E CLIENTS FOR THE CURRENT PERIOD.

IF NOT, CHECK APPROPRIATENESS OF CURRENT N-C-E PLANS.

64

*C-E = COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT
N-C-E = NON-COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT

DISPLAY 5.1.4

SECONDARY PROBLEM: PERCENTAGE OF COMPETITIVELY EMPLOYED REHABILITANTS IS TOO LOW. C-E* GOAL/OCCUPATION CORRESPONDENCE IS TOO LOW BUT % N-C-E* PLANS IS ACCEPTABLE.

QUERY: DOES GOAL PLANNING REALISTICALLY REFLECT LABOR MARKET?

IF NO, MONITOR ONGOING GOAL-SETTING, INSTRUCTING COUNSELORS TO SET GOALS REFLECTIVE OF LABOR MARKET DEMAND.

IF YES, CHECK IF PLACEMENT EFFORTS ARE ADEQUATE.

*C-E = COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT
N-C-E = NON-COMPETITIVE EMPLOYMENT

Table 6(i)

Standard Six, Data Element One

Problem: Client Earning Gain is Insufficient

Scenario	First Level Indicators	
	Percent 26s Earning Minimum Wage 4(i)	Implications
1	Acceptable See 6.1.0	Examine eligibility policy and acceptance practice, as program does not appear to demonstrate economic return on investment.
2	Too low	Earnings at closure are too low. Go to 4.1.0

DISPLAY 6.1.0

PRIMARY PROBLEM: CLIENT EARNING GAIN IS INSUFFICIENT.
(REFER TO TABLE 6(i))

TEST: (FIRST LEVEL INDICATOR)

$$\frac{\#\ 26s\ \text{EARNING MINIMUM WAGE}}{\#\ 26s}$$

(VALUE) XXXX

(NORM) XXXX

ACCEPTABLE? YES

NO

IF YES, EXAMINE ELIGIBILITY POLICY AND ACCEPTANCE PRACTICE.

IF NO, GO TO DISPLAY 4.1.0.

Table 7(i)

Standard Seven, Data Element One

Problem: There is a High Percent of Clients Employed at Closure Who Have Not Retained Their Earnings at Follow-up

Scenario	First Level Indicators		Implications
1	Some of the 26 placements may be invalid. Examine closure and placement policy. Examine plans. Are placements appropriate?	Yes	Examine industry conditions, other explanatory factors (employment rate, health, etc.) Go to 4.2.2
	See 7.1.0	No	Revise agency plan and placement policies.
2	Does the agency serve types of clients who systematically fail to retain jobs? (See 10.1.0)	Yes	Examine acceptance procedures
		No	Are service plans adequate preparation for placements? Go to 4.2.2

DISPLAY 7.1.0

PRIMARY PROBLEM: A HIGH PERCENTAGE OF CLIENTS EMPLOYED AT CLOSURE HAVE NOT RETAINED THEIR EARNINGS AT FOLLOW-UP

(REFER TO TABLE 7(i))

TEST: (FIRST LEVEL INDICATOR)

EXAMINE CLOSURE AND PLACEMENT POLICY AND PLANS

APPROPRIATE? YES

NO

IF YES, EXAMINE INDUSTRY CONDITIONS AND OTHER EXPLANATORY FACTORS. SEE DISPLAY 4.2.2.

IF NO, REVISE AGENCY PLAN AND PLACEMENT POLICIES.

TEST: CHECK IF AGENCY SERVES TYPES OF CLIENTS WHO SYSTEMATICALLY FAIL TO RETAIN JOBS (SEE 10.1.0)

IF YES, EXAMINE ACCEPTANCE PROCEDURES.

IF NO, EXAMINE ADEQUACY OF SERVICE PLANS. SEE DISPLAY 4.2.2.

GENERAL CLIENT AND SERVICE ANALYSES

DISPLAY 10.1.0

PROBLEM: DISPLAYS INDICATE NEED FOR ANALYSIS OF AGENCY CLIENT AND SERVICE PROBLEMS. DATA FILES ON VARIABLES SUCH AS THE FOLLOWING SHOULD BE USED FOR STATISTICAL ANALYSIS OF SERVICES.

CLIENT ANALYSIS VARIABLES LIST:

COUNSELOR
REGION OR AREA
STATUS: 02
02-06
08
10-24
26
28
30

CLOSURE TYPE: C-E (COMPETITIVE PLACEMENT)
N-C-E (NON-COMPETITIVE PLACEMENT)

SERVICE COSTS
DISABILITY
SEVERELY DISABLED
EDUCATION
WORK HISTORY
REFERRAL SOURCE
SERVICES RECEIVED
TIME IN STATUS
EARNINGS AT CLOSURE
CHANGE IN EARNINGS

ANALYSIS OF TIME-IN-STATUS PROBLEMS

DISPLAY 10.2.0
(SEE FIGURE ON NEXT PAGE)

SELECT SAMPLE OF ACTIVE CASES. COMPARE TIMES IN STATUS WITH AGENCY NORMS.

MONTHS 00-02		MONTHS 02-10		MONTHS 02-26	
(VALUE)	XX	(VALUE)	XX	(VALUE)	XX
(NORM)	XX	(NORM)	XX	(NORM)	XX

DO CASES EXCEED TIME IN PROCESS NORMS? NO . .

YES. .

A = # CASES NOT EXCEEDING NORMS

IF YES, ARE THESE CASES UNTIMELY? (USE CASE REVIEW TO DETERMINE IF FLAGGED CASES SHOW UNDUE DELAY.)

NO . . . B = # CASES WITH EXCESS TIME IN PROCESS, BUT JUDGED AS TIMELY.

YES . . . C = # CASES WITH EXCESS TIME IN PROCESS AND JUDGED UNTIMELY.

FOR ALL CASES WITH EXCESS TIME IN PROCESS AND JUDGED UNTIMELY, INVESTIGATE TO IDENTIFY CAUSES (E.G., TYPE OF CLIENT, PLAN, COUNSELOR, DISTRICT, EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS, ETC.)

AND

TEST: $\frac{B}{B + C} \leq$ 20%? YES

NO

IF NO, INCREASE AGENCY TIME IN PROCESS STANDARDS (FLAG FEWER CASES) BEFORE NEXT REVIEW PERIOD.

IF YES, TEST: $\frac{B + C}{A + B + C} \leq$ 5%? YES

NO

IF NO, NO ADJUSTMENT TO FLAGGING IS NEEDED.

IF YES, DECREASE AGENCY TIME IN PROCESS STANDARDS (FLAG MORE CASES) BEFORE NEXT REVIEW PERIOD.

Model Case Flagging System